} 	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/833,119	HESS, CORY D.	
Notice of Allowability	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Fred Ferris	2128	
The MAILING DATE of this communication application application application application application and the communication application and the communication application and the communication application applic	S (OR REMAINS) CLOSED 5) or other appropriate comm RIGHTS. This application is	in this application. If not included nunication will be mailed in due course.	
2. The allowed claim(s) is/are <u>18-24</u> .			
3. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority a) All b) Some* c) None of the: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents hat 2. Certified copies of the priority documents hat 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority of International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * Certified copies not received: Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDON THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE. 4. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be sub INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which give the including changes required by the Notice of Draftspering including changes required by the Notice of Draftspering including changes required by the attached Examine Paper No./Mail Date [b) including changes required by the attached Examine Paper No./Mail Date [dentifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the department of th	ve been received. ve been received in Applicated documents have been received in Applicated documents have been received in Application. E'' of this communication to find the submitted application. In the header according to 37 Coopsit of BIOLOGICAL MAT	ion No ed in this national stage application from the a reply complying with the requirement (AMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE or declaration is deficient. ew (PTO-948) attached or in the Office action of the drawings in the front (not the back) of FR 1.121(d).	ents OF
Attachment(s) 1. ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2. ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No./Mail Date 4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material	6. Interview S Paper No 3/08), 7. Examiner	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) Summary (PTO-413), ./Mail Date s Amendment/Comment s Statement of Reasons for Allowance — Au 2125	•

Part of Paper No./Mail Date 08292005

Application/Control Number: 09/833,119

Art Unit: 2128

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to applicant's After Final Amendment filed on 9
August 2005. Applicants have now cancelled claims 1-17. Claims 18-24 were
previously allowed over the prior art of record.

Response to Arguments

2. Regarding applicants comments relating to claims 1-17: While applicants have now cancelled claims 1-17, the examiner maintains that the claim interpretation is consistent with the broadest reasonable interpretation of a skilled artisan based on the recited claim language as required by MPEP 2111 [R-1], and that the claimed elements are clearly rendered obvious in view of Change and Frigo as recited in the previous 103(a) rejections. Since applicants have now cancelled claims 1-17, and claims 18-24 were previously allowed, this application is now in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 18-24 have been allowed over the prior art of record.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Applicants are disclosing a method for analyzing the performance of an optical span design by selecting components, optimizing the span, and performing margin analysis to determine the amount of change in the operable optical span. This has been disclosed in the prior art of record.

While these elements are individually disclosed in the prior art, the prior art of record does not meet the conditions as suggested in MPEP section 2132, namely:

"The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an **ipsissimis verbis** test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. **In re Bond**, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990)."

In particular, the prior art of record does not disclose the specific sequence of method steps that include:

- receiving incremental change parameters made to operable optical span;
- incorporating changes into component in accordance with case type;
- analyzing changed optical span & determining whether span is operable;
 - determining if changed optical span is an operable span
 - determining if all components and case types of optical span are analyzed
 - presenting the margin analysis results

Further, the examiner has interpreted the claimed <u>case type</u> as specifically defined in applicant's specification page 6, line 21 to page 9, line 9, and in Figures 2 & 3B.

The closest prior art uncovered during examination teaches certain limitations of the claimed invention as follows:

- <u>"Network Simulations with OPNET", X. Chang, Proceedings of 1999 Winter</u>

<u>Simulation Conference, IEEE 1999</u>: Teaches the commercially available OPNET network simulation and modeling tool used for the development and analysis of

Application/Control Number: 09/833,119

Art Unit: 2128

communications networks. The OPNET Modeler provides a GUI based user interface for developing a simulated network model including a Network Editor, Node Editor, Process Editor, Simulation & Debugging tool, Probe editor, Analysis tool, Filter tool, Animation tool, and a Model Library that includes models for popular network architectures (fiber optic, LAN, Ethernet, x.25, etc.), but does not explicitly disclose the specific sequence of method steps in accordance with case type as noted above.

<u>U.S. Patent 5,760,940 issued to Frigo</u>: Teaches determining when a specified threshold power margin at the destination of an optical network fails to meet a threshold (selected) power margin. Frigo teaches determining (by comparing) when power at the received end of the optical span (network) is <u>inoperable</u> by detecting when the power exceeds a threshold (selected) power margin (i.e. the measured power exceeds desired measured power), but does not explicitly disclose the specific sequence of method steps in accordance with case type as noted above.

The features noted above relating to the specific sequence of method steps as noted above and now recited in the independent claim 18 renders the claimed invention non-obvious over the prior art of record. Dependent claims 19-24 are deemed allowable as depending from independent claim 18.

Art Unit: 2128

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays; should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred Ferris whose telephone number is 571-272-3778 and whose normal working hours are 8:30am to 5:00pm Monday to Friday. Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-3700. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jean Homere can be reached at 571-272-3780.

The Official Fax Numbers are:

Official

(703) 872-9306

Fred Ferris, Patent Examiner
Simulation and Emulation, Art Unit 2128
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Randolph Building, Room 5D19
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22313
Phone: (571-272-3778)
Fred.Ferris@uspto.gov
August 29, 2005

Al 218